REMARKS

Claims 1-29 are pending in this application. Claim 1 is amended herein. Support for the amendment to claim 1 may be found at page 5, lines 4-20, page 10, lines 31-36, page 11, lines 10-17, and page 16, lines 24-30 of the English translation of German Application No. 10242917.0, from which the subject application claims priority, and in Fig. 2. Reconsideration is requested based on the foregoing amendment and the following remarks.

Response to Arguments:

The Applicants appreciate the consideration given to their arguments. Applicants were, however, disappointed to find that their arguments were not found to be persuasive.

The Advisory Action mailed June 2, 2008:

The Advisory Action asserts in section 1, at page 2, that:

> Applicant asserts Ott does not teach (a) "an external display to display the current security status of the appliance directly on the outside of the appliance" (remarks; Page 8 / 3rd Para) and (b) in Ott, the security server is not a client computer, i.e. an appliance (Remarks: Page 8 Last Para).

With respect to point (b), the Applicants actually argued, inter alia, that, in Ott, a mobile sensor agent installed on a *client* computer detects events and reports event data *back* to security *server*, rather than displaying the event data "directly on an outside of the appliance," i.e., the location at which the recited "current security status of an appliance" was *detected*. In particular, as described at paragraph [0022]:

> Once deployed and installed on a client computer, a mobile sensor agent detects events and reports event data back to security server 302. As used herein, a field agent is a mobile sensor agent that is distributed from security server 302 to one specific protected client computer.

Thus, in Ott, a mobile sensor agent installed on a client computer detects events and reports event data back to security server 302, so Ott has no need for "external display to display the current security status of the appliance directly on an outside of the appliance," as recited in claim 1, whatever the names used to refer to the security server or the client computer in Ott.

The Advisory Action goes on to assert in section 1, at page 2, that:

> (2) Applicant's argument has no merit since the alleged limitation "a client computer" has not been recited into the claim (i.e. using "appliance" instead).

Whether the client computer in Ott is called an appliance or a client computer makes no

difference, since a mobile sensor agent installed on the client computer detects events and reports event data back to security server in Ott, instead of having an "external display to display the current security status of the appliance directly on an outside of the appliance," which was recited formerly in claim 1. Still, in the interest of compact prosecution only, and not for any reason of patentability, the third clause of claim 1 has been amended to recite:

> An external display disposed directly on an outside of the automation appliance, the external display displaying the current security status of the appliance directly on an outside of the appliance upon which the external display is disposed.

The Advisory Action goes on to assert in section 1, at page 2, that:

> Examiner respectfully disagrees because (1) Ott teaches, in one of its embodiments, the network security system can display the current network status in virtually real-time to an operator of the system (Ott: Para [0043]).

But a network security system that can display the current network status in virtually real-time to an operator of the system does not amount to an "external display to display the current security status of the appliance directly on an outside of the appliance," as recited formerly in claim 1, since the event data in Ott is collected at the client computer and reported back to the operator of the system at the server computer.

Finally, the Advisory Action asserts in section 2, at page 2, that:

> Examiner notes the event log must thus be captured, stored and identified as an event log inside the security server where the security status identified as an internal event log of a server is qualified as an internal display of the server

In Ott, however, the security server deploys a number of mobile sensor agents throughout the *network*, which detect occurrences of specified events. The sensor agents communicate event data back to the respective security *server* for analysis and processing. In particular, as described at paragraph [0020]:

> After the security server (or servers) are physically connected to the network, or after the security server software is loaded onto an existing network server, the security server deploys a number of mobile sensor agents throughout the network. The sensor agents detect occurrences of specified events; an event may be a component of a known attack signature or any detectable event associated with the operation of the protected client computers or the protected computer network. The sensor agents communicate event data back to the respective security server for analysis and processing.

Since, in Ott, the sensor agents communicate event data back to the respective security *server* for analysis and processing, and since the event log must thus be captured, stored and identified

as an event log inside the security *server* of Ott, as noted in the Advisory Action, rather than in whatever client computer the mobile sensor happens to have been deployed, Ott has no "internal display to display the current security status of the appliance within an inside of the appliance," as recited formerly in claim 1.

Still, in the interest of compact prosecution only, and not for any reason of patentability, the fourth clause of claim 1 has been amended to recite:

> An internal display disposed on the inside of the automation appliance, the internal display displaying the current security status of the appliance within the inside of the appliance.

Further favorable consideration is requested.

The final Office Action mailed April 14, 2008:

The final Office Action asserts in section 3, at page 2, that:

> (c) the monitor display is indeed directly on an outside of the server (Ott: Figure 1 / Element 110).

Since, as acknowledged graciously in the final Office Action, the monitor display is on the outside of the *server*, Ott does not "display the current security status of the appliance directly on an outside of the appliance," as recited formerly in claim 1. Event occurrences in Ott, rather, are detected by mobile sensor agents at the *host* level and reported *back* to the security server. Since the monitor display is on the security server, not the host, Ott does not "display the current security status of the appliance directly on an outside of the appliance," as recited formerly in claim 1. In particular, as described the Abstract:

> A computer network security system utilizes mobile sensor agents that detect host-level activities and report event occurrences to a security server connected to the protected network. The security server processes the event data, assesses the current situation/risk status of the network, and manages the distribution of mobile sensor agents in the network in response to the current status of the network.

Since, in Ott, mobile sensor agents detect host-level activities and report event occurrences to a security server connected to the protected network, Ott has no "external display to display the current security status of the appliance directly on an outside of the appliance," as recited formerly in claim 1.

The final Office Action asserts in section 4, at page 4, that:

> (a) Ott teaches an event may be a component of a known attack signature or any detectable event associated with the protected network and the sensor agents

> communicate event data back to the respective security server for analysis and processing (Ott: Para [0020] Line 5 - 11 and Table 1 : Last 4 - 6 Lines).

Since, as acknowledged graciously in the final Office Action, the sensor agents communicate event data back to the respective *security server* for analysis and processing, Ott is not displaying "the current security status of the appliance within an inside of the appliance," as recited formerly in claim 1. In Ott, rather, mobile sensor agents detect host-level activities and report event occurrences to a security server connected to the protected network, as discussed above, so Ott is not displaying "the current security status of the appliance within an inside of the appliance," as recited formerly in claim 1.

Further favorable consideration is requested.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102:

Claims 1-4, 6-9, 11-16, 18-21, 23-27, and 29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0049698 to Ott et al. (hereinafter "Ott"). The rejection is traversed to the extent it might apply to the claims as amended. Reconsideration is earnestly solicited.

The third clause of claim 1 recites:

> An external display disposed directly on an outside of the automation appliance, the external display displaying the current security status of the appliance directly on an outside of the appliance upon which the external display is disposed.

Ott neither teaches, discloses, nor suggests "an external display disposed directly on an outside of the automation appliance, the external display displaying the current security status of the appliance directly on an outside of the appliance upon which the external display is disposed," as recited in claim 1. In Ott, rather, the network security system displays the current situation/risk status of the protected network to an operator of the system, who is at a *server*, not "directly on an outside of the appliance," as recited in claim 1. In particular, as described at paragraph [0043]:

> The network security system can display or otherwise convey the current situation/risk status of the protected network in virtually real-time to an operator of the system (task 618).

Since, in Ott, the network security system displays the current situation/risk status of the protected network to an operator of the system, who is at a server, Ott has no "external display disposed directly on an outside of the automation appliance, the external display displaying the

current security status of the appliance directly on an outside of the appliance upon which the external display is disposed," as recited in claim 1.

Moreover, in Ott, the security *server*, not a client computer, i.e. an "appliance," includes a display monitor. In particular, as described further at paragraph [0043]:

> In the preferred embodiment, the security server includes a display monitor and the security server is capable of rendering a graphical representation of the network status for display on the monitor.

Since, in Ott, the security server includes a display monitor, Ott has no "external display to display the current security status of the appliance directly on an outside of the appliance," as recited in claim 1.

Moreover, in Ott, the situation/risk status of the network enables an operator to quickly determine whether *any* given client computer is vulnerable or under attack. In particular, as described further at paragraph [0043]:

> For example, the situation/risk status of the network can be displayed in any convenient manner that enables an operator to quickly determine whether any given client computer is vulnerable or under attack.

Since, in Ott, the situation/risk status of the network enables an operator to quickly determine whether any given client computer is vulnerable or under attack, Ott has no "external display disposed directly on an outside of the automation appliance, the external display displaying the current security status of the appliance directly on an outside of the appliance upon which the external display is disposed," as recited in claim 1.

In fact, in Ott, a mobile sensor agent installed on a client computer detects events and reports event data *back* to security server 302, rather than "directly on an outside of the automation appliance," as recited in claim 1. In particular, as described at paragraph [0022]:

> Once deployed and installed on a client computer, a mobile sensor agent detects events and reports event data back to security server 302. As used herein, a field agent is a mobile sensor agent that is distributed from security server 302 to one specific protected client computer.

Since, in Ott, a mobile sensor agent installed on a client computer detects events and reports event data back to security server 302, Ott has no "external display disposed directly on an outside of the automation appliance, the external display displaying the current security status of the appliance directly on an outside of the appliance upon which the external display is disposed," as recited in claim 1.

Finally, in Ott, a security server receives data from the protected client computers or other network components, rather than "directly on an outside of the automation appliance," as recited in claim 1. In particular, as described at paragraph [0019]:

> Although not a requirement of the network security system, a security server is preferably realized as a stand-alone PC having a display monitor, a mouse, a keyboard (or other user interface), at least one data communication port configured to receive data from the protected client computers or other network components (e.g., event data from mobile sensor agents), and other common hardware and software features.

Since, in Ott, a security server receives data from the protected client computers or other network components, Ott has no "external display disposed directly on an outside of the automation appliance, the external display displaying the current security status of the appliance directly on an outside of the appliance upon which the external display is disposed," as recited in claim 1.

The fourth clause of claim 1 recites:

> An internal display to display the current security status of the appliance within an inside of the appliance.

Ott neither teaches, discloses, nor suggests "an internal display to display the current security status of the appliance within an inside of the appliance," as recited in claim 1. There is no internal event data log in Ott, contrary to the assertion in the final Office Action in section 5, at page 4. Table 1 is a list of detectable events, not an event log, contrary to assertion in the final Office Action.

Even if there were an internal event data log in Ott, moreover, it would reside on the server, not on the client, since the sensor agents communicate event data back to the respective security *server* for analysis and processing, as discussed above, not "within an inside of the appliance," as recited in claim 1. In particular, as described at paragraph [0020]:

> After the security server (or servers) are physically connected to the network, or after the security server software is loaded onto an existing network server, the security server deploys a number of mobile sensor agents throughout the network. The sensor agents detect occurrences of specified events; an event may be a component of a known attack signature or any detectable event associated with the operation of the protected client computers or the protected computer network. The sensor agents communicate event data back to the respective security server for analysis and processing.

Since, in Ott, the sensor agents communicate event data back to the respective security *server* for analysis and processing, Ott has no "internal display to display the current security status of

the appliance within an inside of the appliance," as recited in claim 1.

In Ott, moreover, the security *server* processes the event data to determine the security status of the network, as discussed above, not "within an inside of the appliance," as recited in claim 1. In particular, as described further at paragraph [0020]:

> The security server processes the event data to determine the security status of the network and to determine whether it would be beneficial to obtain additional event data in order to better assess the security status of the network.

Since, in Ott, the security server processes the event data to determine the security status of the network, Ott has no "internal display to display the current security status of the appliance within an inside of the appliance," as recited in claim 1. Claim 1 is submitted to be allowable. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 is earnestly solicited.

Claims 2, 3, 4, 6-9, 11, and 12 depend from claim 1 and add further distinguishing elements. Claims 2, 3, 4, 6-9, 11, and 12 are thus also submitted to be allowable. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 2, 3, 4, 6-9, 11, and 12 is also earnestly solicited.

Claims 13-16, 18-21, 23, and 24:

The third clause of claim 13 recites:

> Displaying the current security status of the appliance on an outside of the appliance.

Ott neither teaches, discloses, nor suggests "displaying the current security status of the appliance on an outside of the appliance," as discussed above with respect to the rejection of claim 1.

The fourth clause of claim 13 recites:

> Displaying the current security status of the appliance on an inside of the appliance.

Ott neither teaches, discloses, nor suggests "displaying the current security status of the appliance on an inside of the appliance," as discussed above with respect to the rejection of claim 1. Claim 13 is thus submitted to be allowable, for at least those reasons discussed above with respect to the rejection of claim 1. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 13 is earnestly solicited.

Claims 14, 15, 16, 18-21, 23, and 24 depend from claim 13 and add further distinguishing elements. Claims 14, 15, 16, 18-21, 23, and 24 are thus also submitted to be

allowable. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 14, 15, 16, 18-21, 23, and 24 is also earnestly solicited.

Claims 25, 26, 27, and 29:

The third clause of claim 25 recites:

> An external display to display the current security status of the appliance directly on an outside of the appliance.

Ott neither teaches, discloses, nor suggests "an external display to display the current security status of the appliance directly on an outside of the appliance," as discussed above with respect to the rejection of claim 1.

The fourth clause of claim 25 recites:

> An internal display to display the current security status within an inside of the appliance.

Ott neither teaches, discloses, nor suggests "an internal display to display the current security status within an inside of the appliance," as discussed above with respect to the rejection of claim 1. Claim 25 is thus submitted to be allowable, for at least those reasons discussed above with respect to the rejection of claim 1. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 25 is earnestly solicited.

Claims 26, 27 and 29 depend from claim 25 and add further distinguishing elements. Claims 26, 27 and 29 are thus also submitted to be allowable. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 26, 27 and 29 is also earnestly solicited.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103:

Claims 5, 17, and 28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ott in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,910,135 to Grainger (hereinafter "Grainger"). The rejection is traversed. Reconsideration is earnestly solicited.

Claims 5, 17, and 28 depend from claims 1, 13, and 25, respectively and add additional distinguishing elements. Ott neither teaches, discloses, nor suggests "an external display to display the current security status of the appliance directly on an outside of the appliance" or "an internal display to display the current security status of the appliance within an inside of the appliance," as discussed above with respect to the rejection of claim 1. Grainger does not either, and thus cannot make up for the deficiencies of Ott with respect to claims 5, 17, or 28. Claims 5, 17, and 28 are thus also submitted to be allowable. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 5, 17,

and 28 is earnestly solicited.

Claims 10 and 22:

Claims 10 and 22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ott in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0049693 to Douglas (hereinafter "Douglas"). The rejection is traversed. Reconsideration is earnestly solicited.

Claims 10 and 22 depend from claims 1 and 13, respectively and add additional distinguishing elements. Ott neither teaches, discloses, nor suggests "an external display to display the current security status of the appliance directly on an outside of the appliance" or "an internal display to display the current security status of the appliance within an inside of the appliance," as discussed above with respect to the rejection of claim 1. Douglas does not either, and thus cannot make up for the deficiencies of Ott with respect to claims 10 and 22. Claims 10 and 22 are thus also submitted to be allowable. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 10 and 22 is earnestly solicited.

Conclusion:

Accordingly, in view of the reasons given above, it is submitted that all of claims 1-29 are allowable over the cited references. Allowance of all claims 1-29 and of this entire application is therefore respectfully requested.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: July 1, 2008

By: /Thomas E. McKiernan/
Thomas E. McKiernan
Registration No. 37,889

1201 New York Avenue, N.W., 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501